Ť	Case 3:07-cv-02381-JAH-POR Document	1 Filed 12/19/2007 Page 1 of 12				
	ORIGINAL	$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i \cdot A_i \right) = \frac{4\pi^2}{n}$				
1	MUHANNAD TOMA ¹ A78-759-862	FILED				
2	San Diego Detention Center (CCA) P.O. Box 439049	4901 DEC 19 PM 3: 27				
3	San Ysidro, CA 92143-9049	CLERK US DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
4		N. 1234.				
5		BYDEPUTY				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
7	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
8	MUHANNAD TOMA, (A78-759-862), (A78-759-862)	Civil Action 107 CV 2381 JAH POR				
9 10	Petitioner,	PETITION FOR				
11	v. (WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS				
12	MICHAEL CHERTOFF, SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND (28 U.S.C. § 2241)					
13	SECURITY, MICHAEL MUKASEY.)					
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL, ROBIN F. BAKER, DIRECTOR OF SAN DIEGO FIELD OFFICE,					
15	U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT, JOHN A. GARZON, OFFICER-IN-CHARGE,					
16	,					
17	Respondents.					
18						
19	I.					
20	INTROD					
21	The petitioner, Muhannad Toma, respectfully petitions this Court for a writ of habeas corpus					
22	to remedy his unlawful detention.					
[,] 23						
24	¹ The petitioner is filing this petition for a writ of habeas corpus with the assistance of Janet Tung and the Federal Defenders of San Diego, Inc., who drafted the instant petition. That same counsel also assisted					
25	the petitioner in preparing and submitting his request for the appointment of counsel. Robin F. Baker is the director of the San Diego field office of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. He administers federal immigration laws on behalf of the Secretary of Homeland Security in the federal judicial district for the Southern District of California. In Mr. Baker's capacity as the director of the local office of U.S.					
26 27						
28	Immigration and Customs Enforcement, he has immediate control and custody over the petitioner. John A. Garzon is the officer in charge of the detention facility holding the petitioner.					
	_	V8.				

2.7

Petitioner is in the custody of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security and the Attorney General of the United States and their employees (hereinafter "respondents"). He is detained at the respondents' detention facility in San Diego, California, under the control of the officer in charge.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 2241(c)(1) and (3), and U.S. Const. art. I., § 9, cl. 2, because the petitioner is being unlawfully detained as a result of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's misapplication of the provisions of 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6). See Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 686-90 (2001). Moreover, his detention violates the Constitution, the laws, and the treaties of the United States. See Magana-Pizano v. INS, 200 F.3d 603, 610 (9th Cir. 2000); Goncalves v. Reno, 144 F.3d 110, 123 (1st Cir. 1998). Reno v. American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, 525 U.S. 471, 482-83 (1999), makes clear that the petitioner's habeas petition is not barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(g).

Venue is proper in this district because the petitioner is detained here. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 2241, et. seq., and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e).

III.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner, a native of Iraq, entered the custody of Respondents over fifteen months ago, in August 2006, where he has remained since. He was ordered removed from the United States by Respondents on February 13, 2007, over ten months ago. Petitioner cannot be removed to his country of origin or to an alternate country. He is being held in detention by Respondents based upon their misapplication of 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) to indefinitely detain non-removable aliens.

The petitioner was born in Baghdad, Iraq in 1970. In 2000, he fled Iraq as a refugee and entered the United States upon a grant of asylum. Petitioner was ordered removed to Iraq by an immigration judge on February 13, 2007, after being taken into immigration custody in August 2006. Petitioner waived appeal. Petitioner's order of removal became final as of February 13, 2007. See 8 C.F.R. § 1241.1; see also 8 C.F.R. § 1240.15 (appeals to the BIA must be filed within 30 calendar days of the immigration judge's oral decision). Petitioner was found to be entitled to protection under the Convention Against Torture and was granted deferral of removal under 8 C.F.R. § 208.17. See Appendix A (February 13, 2007, Order of

the Immigration Judge), attached hereto.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) conducted a custody review and issued an order to continue detention on or about June 29, 2007. See Appendix B, attached hereto. The order recommended detention on the grounds of the alleged "serious and violent nature of your last conviction, Felony Assault with Deadly Weapon, and numerous Felony convictions for Vandalism." Id. The order further stated that if Petitioner was not "released or removed from the United States by August 12, 2007, jurisdiction of the custody decision in your case will be transferred to the Headquarters Post Order Unit (HQPDU), 801 I St. NW, Washington, DC 20536. HQPDU will made a final determination regarding your custody." Id. To date, Petitioner has received no further communication regarding his custody status, and does not know whether HQPDU has made a determination of his status.

At no time during the ten months since Petitioner was ordered removed has the United States government received travel documents that would permit his repatriation to Iraq. See 8 U.S.C. § 1231(b)(2)(A), (D), (E)(iv)-(vi) (deportable alien must be removed first to country designated by him at deportation hearing, then to country of citizenship, then to listed countries, including the country of birth or that country having sovereignty over it at time of the alien's birth or at time of the deportation.). Because Petitioner has been granted deferral of removal, and there is no indication that deferral has been terminated, Respondents may not remove him to Iraq. See 8 C.F.R. § 208.17. Moreover, as the government of Iraq is in extreme political disarray, having suffered a recent war and continuing civil discord, it is extremely unlikely that its government will issue travel documents to permit Petitioner's removal there in the reasonably foreseeable future. Neither have Respondents obtained travel documents that would permit his removal to any other country. Thus, the United States has had ample opportunities to obtain travel documents, yet has failed to do so. There is therefore no indication that the petitioner can removed to Iraq or any other country, in the reasonably foreseeable future.

IV.

ARGUMENT

THIS COURT MUST RELEASE THE PETITIONER FROM THE CUSTODY OF THE RESPONDENTS UNDER APPROPRIATE CONDITIONS OF SUPERVISION.

Federal law requires the Attorney General to remove a deportable alien from the United States

6

9

12

16

15

17 18

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

within a ninety-day period after an immigration judge's order of removal becomes administratively final. See 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(1); see also Ma v. Ashcroft, 257 F.3d 1095, 1104 (9th Cir. 2002). During the ninetyday removal period, the alien must be detained in custody. See 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(2).

If the Attorney General cannot remove the alien within the statutory removal period, the Attorney General can release the person in question under appropriate conditions of supervision, including regular appearances before an immigration officer, travel restrictions, and medical or psychiatric examinations, among other requirements. See Ma, 257 F.3d at 1104; see also 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(3) (listing the conditions of supervision for deportable or removable aliens released from immigration custody at the expiration of the ninety-day removal period). The Attorney General may detain a deportable or inadmissible alien beyond the ninety-day removal period, however, when he determines that the person in question would "be a risk to the community or unlikely to comply with the order of removal" if released from immigration custody. 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6).

In Zadvydas v. Davis, 533 U.S. 678, 689 (2001), the Supreme Court held that 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(6) only authorizes a period of detention that is reasonably necessary to bring about an alien's removal from the United States, and "does not permit indefinite detention." If a deportable alien has not been released from immigration custody within a six-month period after the issuance of a final order of removal or deportation, "the habeas court must ask whether the detention in question exceeds a period reasonably necessary to secure removal." Id. at 699; see also Ma, 257 F.3d at 1102 n.5 (declaring that in Zadvydas, "the Supreme Court read the statute to permit a 'presumptively reasonable' detention period of six months after a final order of removal-that is, three months after the statutory removal period has ended") (emphasis in original). When a deportable alien "provides good reason to believe that there is no significant likelihood of removal in the reasonably foreseeable future, the Government must respond with evidence sufficient to rebut that showing." Zadvydas, 533 U.S. at 701. Federal officials must release a deportable alien from custody under appropriate conditions of supervision when no "significant likelihood of removal [exists] in the reasonably foreseeable future." Id.; see also Ma, 257 F.3d at 1100 (concluding that federal law does not permit the Attorney General to hold someone "for more than a reasonable period" beyond the ninety-day statutory removal window, and mandates release of the alien under 8 U.S.C. § 1231(a)(3), when the alien "has already entered the United States and there is no reasonable likelihood that a foreign government will accept the alien's return in the reasonably foreseeable future ").

The petitioner has been detained in the custody of respondents since **August 2006**, and has spent, in total, over fifteen months in immigration custody. In the ten months' time since the order of removal became final on **February 13, 2007**, the United States government has not received travel documents that would permit the petitioner's repatriation to Iraq. There is no indication that the petitioner can be removed to that country in the reasonably foreseeable future. The ninety day statutory removal period under 8 U.S.C. § 1231 ended on May 14, 2007, over seven months ago.

The Zadvydas court erected a "presumptively reasonable" six-month detention period during which the federal government should attempt to accomplish all reasonably foreseeable removals pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1231. Zadvydas, 533 U.S. at 701; see also Ma, 257 F.3d at 1102 n.5. The six-month period expired on August 13, 2007. Petitioner's detention beyond the presumptively reasonable detention period announced in Zadvydas violates §1231(a)(6), because it is not significantly likely that the petitioner can be removed to Iraq in the reasonably foreseeable future. See Zadvydas, 533 U.S. at 700; see also Ma, 257 F.3d at 1112 (holding that section 1231 mandates the release of deportable aliens "at the end of the presumptively reasonable detention period" when "there is no repatriation agreement and no demonstration of a reasonable likelihood that one will be entered into in the near future "). Therefore, the petitioner must be released under the conditions set out in §1231(a)(3). See Zadvydas, 533 U.S. at 700-01.

V.

REQUESTED RELIEF

The petitioner requests that this Court order the respondents to release him from custody under the conditions of supervision set forth in 8 U.S.C. §1231(a)(3).

VI.

VERIFICATION

I, Muhannad Toma, hereby verify that the facts contained in the instant petition are true and correct.

Dated: 12-13-07

Wh

Respectfully-submitted,

MUHANNAD TOMA

Petitioner

APPENDIX A

IMMIGRATION COURT 446 ALTA RCAD, STE 5400, COURTROOM 1 SAN DIEGO, CA 92158

In the Matter of

TOMA, MUHANNAD MIKHA Respondent

Case A78-759-862

IN REMOVAL PROSEEDINGS

ORDER OF THE IMMIGRATION JUDGE

proc	is a summary of the oral decision entered on Feb 13, 2007. memorandum is solely for the convenience of the parties. If the egdings should be appealed or reopered, the oral decision will become perfect of the convenience o				
$i\sqrt{1}$	The respectient was ordered removed from the United States to TTAC Respondent's application for voluntary departure was depicd and				
	respondent was ordered removed to alternative to				
C I	Respondent's application for voluntary departure was granted until upon posting a bond in the amount of \$				
C J	with an alternate order of removal to Respondent's application for asylum was ()granted ()denied ()withdrawn.				
C 3	Respondent's application for withholding of removal was ()granted ()denied ()withdrawn.				
C]	Respondent's application for cancellation of removal under section 240A(a) was ()granted ()deried ()withdrawn.				
[]	Respondent's application for cancellation of removal was ()granted under section 240A(b)(1) ()granted under section 240A(b)(2)				
	respondent be issued all appropriate documents recessancy to give				
c 3	errect to this order. Respondent's application for a waiver under section of the TNA unc				
	Respondent's application for adjustment of status ander conting				
	of the INA was ()granted ()denied ()withdrawn. If granted, it was ordered that respondent be issued all appropriate documents necessary to give effect to this order.				
נ ז	Respondent's status was rescinded under contian 244				
/ 	Respondent is admitted to the United States as a until				
l ")	gespandent knowingly filed a frivolous asylum application after proper				
	notice. Respondent was advised of the limitation on discretionary relief for failure Ac appear as ordered is the Immigration Ludgg's continuous.				
	Producting the first of home to long under 8 CFC 208.17 Taker Convey Bate: Feb 13, 2007				
	Appeal: WAIVED Appeal Oce By:				
	7CA 7CA DEPART D				
890	Resorted for DHS. Mirch 15, 2007				

GSO

APPENDIX B

ALIER

Office of Detention and Removal Operations San Diego Field Office

U.S. Department of Homeland Security 880 Front Street San Diego, California 92101



TOMA, Muhannad Mikha C/O Corrections Corporation of America Otay Detention Facility 446 Alta Road, Suite #5400 San Diego, California 92158 A78 759 862

Decision to Continue Detention

This letter is to inform you that your custody status has been reviewed and it has been determined that you will not be released from the custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) at this time. This decision has been made based on a review of your file and/or your personal interview and consideration of any information you submitted to ICE's reviewing officials.

The seriousness and violent nature of your last conviction, Felony Assault with Deadly Weapon, and numerous Felony convictions for Vandalism makes the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement believe that you are a great danger/threat to the community, if released from ICE custody.

Based on the above, you are to remain in ICE custody pending your removal from the United States. You are advised that you must demonstrate that you are making reasonable efforts to comply with the order of removal, and that you are cooperating with ICE's efforts to remove you by taking whatever actions ICE requests to effect your removal. You are also advised that any willful failure or refusal on your part to make timely application in good faith for travel or other documents necessary for your departure, or any conspiracy or actions to prevent your removal or obstruct the issuance of a travel document, may subject you to criminal prosecution under 8 USC Section 1253(a).

If you have not been released or removed from the United States by August 12, 2007, jurisdiction of the custody decision in your case will be transferred to the Headquarters Post Order Unit (HQPDU), 801 I St. NW, Washington, DC 20536. HQPDU will make a final determination regarding your custody.

Signature and Title of Deciding Official

Date

№.44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

			`			•	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS 2007 DEC 19 PM 3: 28				
MUHANNAD T			MICHAEL CHERTOFF, ET AL.				
San Diego Detentio	n Center (CCA), P.O. Box 43		CLERK US DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
San Ysidro, CA 92 (b) County of Residence of	143 First Listed Plain tiff SAN DIEGO		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant SAN DIEGO				
	CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) DEPHTY			
) CON DEMN ATION CASES, US NVOLVED.	E THE LOCATION OF THE	
(C) Attorney's (Firm Name	, Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Kno	wn)	(619) 557-5662	
PRO SE	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			KAREN P. HEWITT, U.S. ATTY			
78	7 CV 2381 JAH P	0R			PROCESS CLERK	GD 00101	
					REET, SAN DIEGO,		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	lin		ZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)	
1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question		Citizen (PT of This State □		PTF DEF Principal Place	
Plain tiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizon	J. 1 1110 G. 1110	of Business In	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
🕱 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	-	Citizen	of Anoth er State		**************************************	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				of Business In	A nother State	
				or Subject of a □ gn Country	3 3 Foreign Nation	. 🗆 6 🗆 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	Γ (Place an "X" in One Box Only)						
CONTRACT	TORTS			ITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL IN 310 Airplane 362 Person al Inju			Agricu lture Other Food & Drug	422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment☐ 410 Antitrust	
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med . Malpra Liability ☐ 365 Person al Inju		☐ 625	D rug Relate d Seiz ure of Property 21 USC 881	☐ 423 With drawal 28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking☐ 450 Com merce/IC C Rates/e ic.	
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liab Slander ☐ 368 Asbestos Per	ility		Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS	→ □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and	
☐ 151 Medicare Act	□ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Produ		☐ 650	Airline Regs. Occupation al	☐ 820 Copyrights	Corrupt Organizations B 10 Selective Service	
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	Liability Liability ☐ 340 Marine PERSO NAL PR O	PER TY		Safety/Health	□ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark	☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
(Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment **	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Len	ding	- 690	Other LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	Exchange B75 C ustom er Challenge	
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Person ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Dar		710	Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 H1 A (139 5ff)	12 USC 3410 B91 Agricultural Acts	
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability 385 Property Dar 360 Other Personal Injury Product Liab			Act Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIW W (405(g))	□ 892 Econo mic Stabilizatio n Act □ 893 Environm ental M atters	
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PET	TITIONS	s	Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	□ 864SSID Title XVI	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act☐ 895 Freedom of	
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	441 Voting 510 Motions to V	acate	1	& Disclosure Act	B65 RS1 (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	Information A ct 900 Appeal of Fee Determination	
☐ 220 Fo reclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment Sentence ☐ 443 Housin g/ Habeas Corpus:			Railway Labor Act	□ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plain tiff	Under Equal Access to Justice	
☐ 240 Torts to Land☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations 530 General 535 Death Penal			Other Labor Litigation	or Defendant)	☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
□ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights ☐ 540 Mandamus ☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Cond		791	Em pl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 871 IRS— Third Party 26 USC 7609	□ 890 Other Statutory Actions	
V ORIGIN (PLAC	E AN "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)					Appeal to District	
V. ORIGIN		П 4	1 -	_ another	erred from r district v)	Judge from rict □ 7 Magistrate	
	emoved from 3 Remanded from late Court Appellate Court	4	Reopen		y) — Multidistr Litigation	ludgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a Do not cite jurisd ictional statutes un less dive		nd write br	iefstatement of cause.			
			28 U.S	S.C. § 2241			
VII. REQUESTED IN	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS AC	TION	DEM	IAND \$	CHE CK Y ES only	if dem anded in com plaint:	
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		JURY DEMAND	: Yes No			
VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE				DOCKET NUMBER		
DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTOPNEY OF RECOI							
X 12-3-07	X W	lu					
RECEIPT # M579 A	MOUNT 9. APPLYING I	EP.		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE	
12/19/157 60							
/N/ 1 110 /	W_						

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN DIEGO DIVISION

145730 - SR

December 19, 2007 15:31:33

Habeas Corpus

USAD #.: 07CV2381 HABEAS Judge..: JOHN A HOUSTON

Amount.:

\$5.00 MO

Check#.: 734824949

Total-> \$5.00

FROM: TOMA V. CHERTOFF

HABEAS

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Page 12 of 12

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

) Case No. TBA					
707 CV 2381 JAH POR					
) PROOF OF SERVICE					
))					
)) .)					

I, the undersigned, say:

- 1) That I am over eighteen years of age, a resident of the County of San Diego, State of California, and not a party in the within action;
- 2) That my business address is 225 Broadway, Suite 900, San Diego, California, 92101;
- 3) That I served the within CIVIL COVER SHEET, PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS, NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL, AND DECLARATION OF JANET C. TUNG IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER'S MOTIONS, placing a true copy of the above-mentioned document in the United States mail on December 19, 2007, to:

KAREN P. HEWITT, U.S. ATTORNEY ATTN: Civil Processing Clerk 880 Front Street San Diego, CA 92101

I certify under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on 19 December 2007 at San Diego, California.

SYLMIA ENRIQUE